UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,585	06/26/2003	Timothy Alan Dietz	AUS920030172US1	5966

25299	7590	09/15/2008	
IBM CORPORATION			
PO BOX 12195			
DEPT YXSA, BLDG 002			
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709			

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/607,585
Filing Date: June 26, 2003
Appellant(s): DIETZ ET AL.

Timothy Alan Dietz
Walid M. Kobrosly
Nadeem Malik
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 07/05/2008 appealing from the Office action mailed

02/06/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2003/0182449   Anderson et al.   09-2003

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 USC § 102. This rejection is set forth

in the Final Office Action mailed on 02/06/2008 and as shown below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Anderson et al. [US Patent Application No 2003/0182449].

3.   As per claim 1, Anderson discloses the invention as claimed including in a World Wide

Web (Web) communication network with user access via a plurality of data processor controlled

interactive receiving display stations for displaying received Web documents accessible from

database sources on the Web [Figure 1; and paragraphs 0046-0049], a system for simplifying

the Uniform Resource Locators (URLs) displayed for each received Web document [simplify a

particular web site] [Figure 3; and paragraph 0058] comprising:

         service provider for accessing Web documents for said receiving display stations

responsive to user requests [i.e. ISPs or Web page providers] [paragraphs 0050 and 0053];

         remote Web database source servers [8, Figure 1; and paragraph 0049], responsive to

service provider requests including:

         apparatus for accessing requested Web documents from said a database sources [i.e. the

web site server responds to the request] [6, Figure 1; and paragraph 0049], and

         apparatus for defining the URLs for said accessed Web documents to include a URL

domain section and automatically generated URL path portion within the database source [i.e.

i.e. map secondary address to primary address] [32, Figure 2; Figure 3; and paragraphs 0056-

0059]; and

         apparatus in said service provider to convert the original URLs of said accessed Web

documents to include a domain section specifying the service provider's domain and a path

portion within said service provider's domain simpler and shorter than the original URL path

portion [i.e. secondary address is shorter than primary address] [Figure 3; Abstract; and

paragraphs 0013, 0048, 0049 and 0103-0105];

apparatus in said service provider for respectively reconverting said converted URLs

back to the original URLs; wherein Web document requests directed to said converted URLs

will respectively be transmitted through the service provider to remote database sources on the

Web [i.e. lookup mapping to determine primary address] [Figure 3; paragraphs 0013, 0049,

0056 and 0062]; and

apparatus in said service provider for charging a user a fee for activating said apparatus

for converting an original URL [paragraphs 0109-0120].

4.   As per claim 6, Anderson discloses wherein said user activating said apparatus for

converting is a host of a Web database source defining the original URL [Figure 1; and

paragraphs 0049 and 0085].

5.   As per claims 8 and 13, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1

and 6.

6.   As per claims 21 and 23, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1

and 6.

(10) Response to Argument

1.   As per argument, Appeal Brief, pages 10 and 11, Appellant's argued that (1) Anderson

fails to teach "apparatus in said service provider to convert the original URLs of said accessed

Web documents to include a domain section specifying the service provider's domain",

specifically Appellant' argued that in Anderson, the conversion is done at the user terminal, not

at a service provider.

2.   As to point (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, as shown in Figure 1,

Anderson shows a user device 4, a bango server 8 and website server 6 [i.e. broadly interpreted

as display station, service provider and remote Web database source server as claimed] [

paragraph 0046]. Anderson discloses a remote database server, i.e. bango server, for mapping

numeric suffixes to primary addresses of the website servers [8, Figure 1; and paragraph 0058].

Bango addressing provides a solution by defining a "bango" number and the linkage and

management of this number to one or more URLs., the bango number enables a browser user or

WWW capable device to simply enter a numeric sequence of numeric digits in order to be able

to navigate to a specific WWW address [paragraph 0108]. Initially, the process starts when

user enters hot keys 12 and 14 on the keypad of the user device, the hot keys represent the

second URL address including alphanumeric prefix, which is the URL address of the bango

server, followed by a numeric suffix which is the path to the primary URL address of the website

server [Abstract]. As shown in Figure 3, the bango server stores the mapping for plurality of

numeric suffixes and primary addresses [paragraph 0058]. As an example, the request from

user device 4 will be forwarded to the bango server at www.bango.net with a path representation

of 911 [30, Figure 2; and paragraphs 0056, 0101-0107]. In this example, the bango server 8

provides the mapping for URL address of the website server 6 [i.e.

us.porsche.com/english/911/models/default.htm], from the alphanumeric prefix that the bango

server receives [i.e. www.bango.net is a domain section specifying the service provider's domain], and a numeric suffix [i.e. 911 is a path portion within said service provider's domain] [broadly interpreted as convert the original URLs of said accessed Web documents to include a domain section specifying the service provider's domain and a path portion within said service provider's domain simpler and shorter than the original URL path portion [i.e. numeric suffix 911 is much simpler and shorter than us.porsche.com/english/911/models/default.htm] as claimed] [Figures 2 and 3; and paragraphs 0101-0107].

In summary, Anderson clearly explains that the bango server 8 [i.e. broadly interpreted as service provider as claimed] performs the steps of converting the URL address between the user device 4 and website server 6. As such, the process of converting is not done on the user device 4, but it is being performed at the bango server 8 [i.e. broadly interpreted as service provider as claimed] [Abstract]. Therefore, the claims remain rejected over the cited prior art, and as such the claimed language as written, is unpatentable.

3.   As per argument, Appeal Brief, page 11, Appellant's argued that (2) Anderson does not disclose "user activating said step of converting is a host of a Web database source defining the original URL".

4.   As to point (2), in Anderson, Bango addressing provides a solution by defining a "bango" number and the linkage and management of this number to one or more URLs., the bango number enables a browser user or WWW capable device to simply enter a numeric sequence of numeric digits in order to be able to navigate to a specific WWW address [paragraph 0108].

Anderson discloses bango numbers may be allocated by using a standard "user registration"

process [paragraphs 0088-0099], and in addition, Anderson discloses **the operator of the**

remote database server 8 may establish the mapping of numeric suffixes and the URL

address of the website server [i.e. broadly interpreted as user activating said step of converting is

a host of a Web database source defining the original URL as claimed] [paragraphs 0063 and

0067]. Therefore, the claimed language as written, is unpatentable over the cited prior art.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related

Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dustin Nguyen/

Examiner, Art Unit 2154

Conferees:

/Nathan J. Flynn/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151